



User: Marsha Primeau

In Course: Dev Action Research Using Educ. Tech. (EDT 656 FD08 FALL 2010)

Instructor: [Dr. Aida Michlowski](#)

This Activity Section is open to the entire class.

Initial Message

Subject: Analyzing data

Posted by [Dr. Aida Michlowski](#) Tue Nov 2 22:14:27 2010.

Message: Briefly state what your research is about. What results did you find? Share your successes and challenges? Any surprises or disappointments?

Just a reminder: Click Reply to respond to this question and click Subthread to respond to your classmates' post.

The following replies have been posted:

Posted by [Jill Risse](#) Wed Nov 3 11:36:42 2010.

Message: Research:

Over the last month I have collected data to help me determine if 8th graders' comprehension scores of books read in literature circles were higher using online blogging or oral discussion. My students were required to participate in both face-to-face discussions and online discussions about their literature circle book. Discussion one was conducted orally; discussion two was conducted online; for discussion three, students choose oral or online.

Results:

My research found that the method of discussion had very little effect on the comprehension scores of the 40 students that participated in my study. The average comprehension scores for each discussion were as follows:

- Discussion 1 (oral): 13.0 out of 16
- Discussion 2 (online): 12.9 out of 16
- Discussion 3 (both): 13.2 out of 16

There is only a variance of .3 out of 16, which is almost too little to say that the discussion methods had any huge effect on the scores. At the end of my research study, I asked my students what discussion method they preferred. The results of the survey showed:

- 45% preferred online discussion
- 35% preferred both discussion methods
- 20% preferred oral discussion

Again, because the average discussion scores were so close, it's also difficult to say that student preference had any effect on their scores.

Successes/Challenges/Surprises/Disappointments:

Though there weren't any definite trends (which sometimes can be disappointing), it's good to know that both of these discussion methods can be used to give me a consistent comprehension score. I also learned that I can use either discussion method to help me differentiate and meet the needs of my students.

Though most of my research went very smoothly, we did hit a major roadblock in the beginning. As we all know, with technology there can be tech problems and glitches. A week before we started this unit, I took my students to the lab to get logged onto the blog and practice blogging. I soon found out that some kids didn't remember their emails and passwords (which was where their Edublogs username and passwords were sent to). If they had to open a new email account, I had to go back in and reassign them a new Edublogs username and password. Also, if some students already had an Edublogs account, I had to give them a new username. After we first got on the blog, I discovered I had to reconfigure their settings because they couldn't see other people's posts. It was a bit of a mess right away, but that practice day allowed me to work out all the glitches and get it ready to go smoothly for the first online discussion!

4 subthreads

Posted by [Kelly Bartel](#) Sat Nov 6 11:14:56 2010.

Message: Jill, I am so surprised at your results. I was thinking that the students would really enjoy online blogging, especially with it being so new to them. I would of thought your results would have been really different. It's really great to know that you can now do either way (online, or oral) for assessing to meet the needs of all your students and the scores won't really change.

Form a subthread

Posted by [Ashley Redman](#) Tue Nov 9 12:05:21 2010.

Message: During the month of October, I collected data that helped me determine whether or not 8th graders' tested better using classroom clickers or paper and pencil methods of assessment. I divided my participants into two groups. During the first assessment, Group A took the assessment using clickers and Group B took the assessment using paper and pencil. During the second assessment, Group A and Group B switched methods of assessment.

Results:

My quantitative results found very little difference in assessment methods in terms of average assessment scores. The average assessments scores for assessment one were as follows:

- Group A (clickers): 85.85%
- Group B (paper & pencil): 83.29%

The average assessment scores for assessment two were as follows:

- Group A (paper & pencil): 83.9%
- Group B (clickers): 76.53%

During assessment one, the scores were not statistically significant enough to assume that clickers had an effect on scores. While assessment two proved the opposite, clicker-based test scored lower than paper and pencil, but again, not statistically significant. The results of both assessments showed that Group A scored higher on both assessments, regardless of the method used.

My qualitative results depended on my student's responses to what method they actually preferred as well as what they liked and didn't like about the assessment methods. When asked what method of

assessment my students preferred, 49% of the participants preferred clicker assessments while 51% preferred paper and pencil assessments. With this data being so close, it is difficult to say if the student's preference had any effect on how they scored during the assessments.

Successes/Challenges/Surprises/Disappointments:

The biggest disappointment for me was that there was no definite effect on test scores with either method of assessment. On one hand, that is reassuring as an educator, because I know that clickers do not completely effect assessment scores and therefore, the continued use of them will not deteriorate my student's scores. I can see from the data I collected, students test equally the same on both methods of assessments. As far as assessment preferences go, I believe students prefer what they are familiar with. For both qualitative and quantitative results, I feel that a longer window of research would show much more accurate results.

Another disappointment or maybe a surprise was the preference method from my students. In the beginning of my research, and based off of the student's clicker enthusiasm, I predicted that my students would without a doubt prefer clicker assessments. The main reason I thought this was the use of something techy for tests, but even more so, the capabilities of having instantaneous results. It surprised me to see that the preferences was an almost even split with participants.

A major challenge for me was the time it took to input all of my assessment questions into Exam View Software (the software used to run clicker assessments). It was very tedious and time consuming. Another challenge is the organization of running a class on clickers. No matter how many times you practice the use of clickers, students still find a way to pick the wrong clicker. Clicker pads are assigned to a particular student and the results are recorded with that clicker to a specific student through the software. When a student mixes up his/her clicker, there is no way to transfer the score to another student. Lastly, with any use of technological tools, there is the potential risk that something won't work correctly. A few times throughout the unit, the clicker receiver would have to be re-loaded or my computer or my computer wasn't able to pick up the receiver automatically. Not a major deal, but more of an annoyance.

6 subthreads

Posted by [Jodi Schmidt](#) Fri Nov 12 14:27:20 2010.

Message: My research was about the effects of listening centers on emergent literacy. I set up five different listening centers, some used technology. I used one of my groups as the control group and the other group was my experimental group. I administered a pre and post test as well as a survey to see what center they enjoyed the most. The results were exactly what I thought I would find. Both groups showed growth in concept of book skills. The control group received less skill traing but showed growth from the routine instruction I gave them.

I had a lot of fun watching the children interact with the technology. Seeing them listening to a book on an i-Pod and online was pretty fun. They enjoyed the extra listening center time. I plan to set up the centers again for the control group to experience the same thing.

3 subthreads

Posted by [Kelly Bartel](#) Sat Nov 13 12:09:11 2010.

Message: My research was to see if students learn their sight words better playing board games or online games. I too was very surprised by my results. Both types of learning showed improved test scores, but the online games showed a little more improvement. Looking back- I do not know if my students scored higher after the online games because it was 2nd time they were being exposed to the words or they truly

learned more? Students seemed to enjoy playing board games and online games just as much, but I had more full time attention when the online games were being played.

I would have to say my disappointments were that there was not a significant difference between their scores, but I was happy to see that the more practice the students are exposed to with their words they are still learning. It doesn't matter which way they are being exposed to. While the students were playing on the computer- they definitely seemed more interested and their attention was held longer, but when the final survey was done in the end- 11 kids enjoyed the computer and 8 kids enjoyed playing the board games better. The results blew me away, especially in the way they performed in the classroom.

4 subthreads

Posted by [Lashaunda Johnson](#) Sat Nov 13 12:19:44 2010.

Message: My research question is How satisfied are Marian University traditional undergraduate students with the technology resources and support offered by the Information Technology Department? To uncover the satisfaction levels I used an online satisfaction survey.

The survey was sent to 1,445 students. Of the 1,445 survey invitations sent, 106 students or approximately 7% completed the survey. I wasn't really surprised by the low response rate as most surveys on a scale such as this do not gain 100% or even 50% completion. The survey showed the question with the highest average rating was Email satisfaction and the lowest average rating was PowerCAMPUS satisfaction. The low PowerCAMPUS average rating was not surprising as most students, about 87%, rated this question as not applicable which is reasonable since most don't use this system.

Since the survey I used was also done in 2005, I was able to compare the average ratings that the questions received in 2005 and 2010. In 2005 only 54 students completed the survey so the 2010 survey had about a 50% increase in the number of responses versus 2005. In looking at the comparisons, mainly every question received a higher average rating in 2010 versus 2005. The question with the largest increase in rating was web development satisfaction (increase of 0.5). The question with the largest decrease in rating was how many times in the past year students contacted IT for assistance (decrease of 0.95).

Overall, I think the process went fairly smoothly. I didn't really have any surprises in carrying out the survey or the methodology. In analyzing the survey results there were some surprises in seeing the average ratings but nothing profoundly unanticipated.

3 subthreads

Posted by [Marsha Primeau](#) Sat Nov 13 16:37:08 2010.

Message: My research focused on my 4th grade students comparing learning from traditional textbook activities versus learning from a WebQuest. I chose two units in Social Studies that were of equal difficulty. I taught the Southwest Region using the textbook and accompanying activities, and the Southeast Region through the use of a WebQuest (<http://www.ikm-manning.k12.ia.us/Technology/southeast/index.html>). I was somewhat surprised in the results, in that I thought there would be a bigger discrepancy. The results were considered not to be statistically significant. The mean of the textbook post-test was 88.12 and the mean of the WebQuest post-test was 85.80.

I also had students fill in a survey as to what their learning preference was. Not surprisingly, most students preferred the WebQuest. The comments indicated that they enjoyed working on computers and they thought it was more fun to learn on a WebQuest. I asked a variety of questions as far as which one was easier to find information, which one they participated more in, etc... There were 23 favorable

responses for the textbook, 99 for the WebQuest, and 38 uncertain responses. I was surprised to read some of the comments students wrote. A few wrote, "I just like reading from a book better." This supports the idea that not all students learn the same way.

The last area that I looked at was time on task. There was not much of a difference when it came to this area either. One thing that was of interest was that towards the end of the lesson, more students who were working on the textbook activities were on task versus the WebQuest learners at the end of the lesson. It seems that towards the end of the lesson, students on the computers were getting tired of finding information and being on the computer. They needed more guidance.

The challenging part of using technology is making sure that everything is working properly. We had a day that we couldn't print from the computers and it was very frustrating. It was also difficult to get all the 4th graders on the correct WebQuest page initially because they had to type in the URL exactly as it was to get it to work. Once they had it opened up to the site, I made sure it was saved in the favorites so that we wouldn't have to go through that every time! Keeping the students on track with the WebQuest was also somewhat challenging. I tried to stick to the same time-line with each lesson; however some students did not finish their WebQuest in the time that was allotted. It was much easier to get off-task when finding information on-line. However; one could argue that maybe their learning experience was more thorough.

I think my results support the idea that incorporating technology into learning is important, but that we also need to vary our teaching strategies to make sure we are reaching out to all of our students. It's nice to try different things to keep their attention and motivation. I was also glad to see that the students didn't score lower on the WebQuest than on the textbook, indicating that the learning outcomes were very similar.

[Modify post](#)

[2 subthreads](#)

Posted by [Molly Aird](#) Sat Nov 13 19:56:38 2010.

Message: My research was to see if children learn better with digital recordings or if using a traditional method of one on one, helped students to learn their letters in their name. My morning class listened to their name on a digital recording using an iPod. In my afternoon class, I worked one on one with each student for two minutes singing their name out loud. The end result for my digital recording group was that there was an overall 85% increase in scores from the pre-test to post test. As for my traditional methods the group improved by 50%.

Both groups enjoyed learning using music in their own way but I feel that the digital recordings are the best use of music. Once the children got started listening they were uninterrupted for the full two minutes. I often found myself getting interrupted with my traditional group as I am the only teacher in the room and rarely have a parent volunteer. I was surprised as to how engaged my traditional group was and how excited they were. But they did not know that my morning class got to listen to their name on recording. I am excited to record the names of my students that did not do it digitally for my research.

[1 subthreads](#)

Posted by [Diane Banaszak](#) Sun Nov 14 07:34:18 2010.

Message: My research focused on whether or not my second graders learned their math facts better using manipulative games or using computer games. I randomly divided my students into two groups; the control group and the experimental group. The control group practiced their math facts playing games using cards, dice, and dominos while the experimental group played two different games that I found online. One of these games timed the students the other online game did not. The students practiced 15

minutes a day for four weeks.

I collected data three different ways. The first was through a pre/post test to measure the gains students made with understanding their math facts. The students in my control group had an average gain of 7.8, while the students in my experimental group had a gain of 7.3. Both groups have shown improvement with the control group showing just a bit more. It was very close though. The second method of data collection I used was through observational notes. I made notes on how on task students were during the time they were practicing their facts. I found this information very interesting. The students in the control group had a higher percentage of being on task during the last two weeks. The students in the experimental group were more on task than the control group the first two weeks. My final piece was a post student survey. These results were mixed. Students in both groups reported liking and not liking the game they were assigned to. Four students in the control group liked their game while two students did not. Two students in the experimental group liked their game while four students did not. Seven students in both groups felt the facts helped them learn their math facts better.

When I began this study, I wondered if the students on the computer would be more excited about their games. It just seems like my students always get excited when they get to work on computers. I was surprised that a few more students liked their game in the group playing manipulative games as compared with the students playing computer games. I also thought it was interesting that the average gain both groups made was very close. There was only a half question difference. My students playing the manipulative games did just a little better. I have often wondered if using computers was more motivational. I also thought too that the computers held my students attention better. However that wasn't the case throughout my research. It started out that way the first two weeks and then flipped. I am questioning if that is because they were getting bored with the games. Also the students on the computers played one game the first two weeks and a different one the second two weeks. The game the last two weeks was the game that timed the students to see how many questions they could answer in two minutes. I have never been a big fan of timing students and wonder if that was a factor in the results.

Throughout the research I was surprised that there weren't any major problems. I was concerned that I might not be able to schedule consistent times in the computer lab. Especially because of the computer testing the 3rd, 4th, and 5th graders were completing at the same time I was completing my research. I didn't have any problems getting into the computer lab. The students also did a great job getting signed on to the computers quickly and also got to the game and started without any big issues.

4 subthreads

Posted by [Teri Weyenberg](#) Sun Nov 14 09:11:39 2010.

Message: My research involved using Mimio, which is like a Smartboard, to teach 4-year-old kindergarten students counting skills up to 10. I assessed the students with a pre and posttest, observations, and a survey. One week the students used the Mimio to play interactive games that focused on counting, and the second week the students did traditional math activities using hands-on manipulatives. I assessed students after each week to check for progress.

My results came out great! The students improved 25% using the Mimio compared to 8% with the traditional math activities. The students were very engaged and focused on the Mimio activities. I did notice that my higher academic students were less engaged than others, but I wonder if the concept was too easy, and they needed a more difficult game. My survey results showed that 34 out of 35 students enjoyed using the MImio.

I thought the Mimio was a great way to teach math concepts as well as many other concepts that we will begin soon. This was the students first time using the interactive board, so at first it was a bit difficult. It was fun to watch how they improved on using it throughout the week. My only difficulty with the Mimio was the shadows it projected while the students were in front of it. That was difficult for them to work

around. I am not sure how to fix that, but I am sure we can all get used to it.

Overall, I was very impressed and happy to see that the Mimio did improve student scores. Some children learned more through the hands-on activities, but that just proves all students learn in different ways, which is what we all try to integrate into our lessons everyday.

3 subthreads

Posted by [Dawn Brenner](#) Sun Nov 14 10:16:56 2010.

Message: The research question that I addressed was does a one-to-one Netbook® program in a middle school setting will affect student performance and parent satisfaction with our one-to-one Netbook® program. I had the students go to a different internet site everyday and play around with them. I found many interactive labs and videos that the students were engaged with. I found that the students test scores were not increased while using the Netbooks however, I am unsure whether this is due to the level of difficulty in material or due to the Netbook integration. The parent satisfaction increased from 30% to an average of 80%.

When I had my parent teacher conferences, many parents stated that they were happy with the policies set forth for the use of the Netbooks and they were happy to see them finally being utilized properly. I felt that this was a huge success.

I was a bit disappointed that the students test scores were not increased, however again, I am unsure of if it was the level of difficulty of the subject or was it because of Netbook integration. It would be interesting to compare the test scores for this chapter versus another chapter with Netbook integration again.

4 subthreads

Posted by [Lynelle Reak](#) Sun Nov 14 19:41:30 2010.

Message: My action research study compared three different sophomore English classes when reading Shakespeare's Julius Caesar, Act 1. Students in the control group were assigned parts, and we read the play aloud. The first experimental group listened to an audio book version of the Act and followed along in their books. The second experimental group were assigned parts, read the play aloud, and then watched YouTube versions of the play.

All three groups were given the same posttest and a survey asking them questions pertaining to the method used in reading Shakespeare. I took observation logs on each of the three classes looking for on task behaviors and off task behaviors.

The results were completely surprising to me. My control group scored the highest on the posttest (not far above the listening group). The group that was presented the play in video scored the lowest mean score (equal to an F on the grading scale.)

I concluded in my discussion paper that students sometimes can be overexposed to too many sensory devices at once. Technology offers teachers many modes to use in the classroom, but sometimes the students are over-stimulated.

Another important discovery was found on the survey. Many of the students in the control group liked the pace at which we read the play. This method offered them opportunities to pause and ask questions. The listening group supported this theory in their survey answer because they thought the tape went too fast for comprehension of the language and plot.

Overall, I learned that using a combination of devices with technology is a good idea, but there needs to be many opportunities for the students to pause and ask questions.

1 subthreads